

**Minutes
State Board of Education
Monday, May 24, 2004**

The Arizona State Board of Education held its monthly meeting at the Arizona State Capitol Executive Tower, Second Floor Conference Room, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was called to order at 9:10AM.

Members Present

Ms. Nadine Mathis-Basha, President
Dr. Matthew Diethelm, Vice President
Ms. Armida Bittner
Ms. JoAnne Hilde
Ms. Evangelina “Conkie” Hoover
Superintendent Tom Horne
Ms. Joanne Kramer
Dr. John Pedicone

Members Absent

Dr. Michael Crow

Board Business

Pledge of Allegiance, moment of silence and roll call.

Minutes for State Board of Education

Motion by Dr. Pedicone to approve minutes as written for the State Board of Education meeting and Executive Session on April 26, 2004. Seconded by Dr. Diethelm. *Motion passes.*

Business Reports

Ms. Basha reported that Ms. Christy Farley, Executive Director, gave birth to her son on Friday, May 21, 2004, a month earlier than planned.

President’s Report

Ms. Basha expressed appreciation to Chino Valley for hosting the last State Board meeting and to the members for being willing to travel to other areas. In addition, Ms. Basha commended the Board members for the extra energy put into last week’s Study Session.

Superintendent’s Report

Superintendent Horne did not submit a report at this time.

Member Reports

Ms. Bittner offered congratulations to Dr. Margaret Garcia Dugan and Ms. Irene Moreno for the wonderful Structured English Immersion workshop with close to 500 attendees. The program was done well, very professionally and Ms. Bittner spoke with others who also appreciated the information.

Dr. Pedicone summarized a meeting that was held at ACSI with Dr. Flores, Chancellor, Pima College. The discussion with Dr. Flores was about comments he had made regarding national concern about high school graduates needing remediation when they leave our high schools. Dr. Flores’ contention was that they are spending a lot of time remediating high school graduates prior to their entering the university or college. Additional factors considered were whether the students are recent high school graduates or at the community college level are they students who entered college five years or longer after high school graduation. The collective discussion was about what those graduates looked like over time. Further conversation went to the predictability of success at the university level and whether AIMS makes a difference. The answer appears to be ‘no.’ As the conversation was pursued the question was asked, “what does matter” and Dr. Flores said there were a number of factors, but AIMS was not something he considered. Also, in discussing this with Dr. Likins at a P20 meeting, Dr. Pedicone noted that at this juncture, AIMS is not being considered to be an entrance test that qualifies students to get into the university. The question then is, “what is the purpose of AIMS and what does it give the graduates?” The question was also asked of the business community with the assumption being made that if a student

passes AIMS they should be more qualified to enter the workforce, but Dr. Pedicone is not sure the business community can say this with any great degree of confidence. As a result, Dr. Pedicone put out the challenge for everyone to ask the question, "What is the promise made with AIMS?" The Arizona Department of Education has spent a lot of time and made valiant efforts to get the system in place, which is now manageable and students are being tested but the question is still whether it makes any difference. Before this becomes mandatory for student graduation, future conversations could include the purpose of AIMS, what does it give students, is it a promise made and kept, and are students better off if they can pass the standards. Dr. Pedicone stated that efforts are being made to determine whether or not at the end of the AIMS test students are better off as a result. This discussion needs to continue at a greater and more rapid pace to see if we are really doing justice to students.

Superintendent Horne responded that after considerable discussion and long delay while the matter was studied, the Board of Regents decided to give a full scholarship to students who exceeded standards on the AIMS plus some other requirements. Another study done at the University of Arizona showed that between the SAT, ACT and AIMS, the AIMS was as good a predictor of college success as the SAT or ACT.

Dr. Pedicone stated he heard this report also and there are questions surrounding the details of that statement. However, Dr. Pedicone stated he was not suggesting the statement is not accurate, but suggested there is so much depending on students passing AIMS and not all students are going to enter a university. Dr. Pedicone added that consideration should be given to the average student who graduates with a "meets expectations" on the AIMS and what are they getting as a result? He added that this is a critical time to ask the question and if this does not happen, we will have failed in not asking this critical question. The student may meet the standards, but there are lots of ways of determining that. Dr. Pedicone stressed that he was not being argumentative, but rather this is a critical juncture and in a year and a half this will be critical for all Arizona students.

Dr. Diethelm stated he will be at the third and final meeting with the NASBE research group regarding "Closing the Achievement Gap". This group will report at the national conference in October. Dr. Diethelm noted that the findings may show successes that correlate with the programs the Arizona State Board of Education has been contemplating and trying to put forward in terms of the structure of the programs. The other common thread is extra time, energy, and resources so he stressed that doing better costs extra time and probably money. Dr. Diethelm added that the NASBE experience offers value added and encouraged members to participate with NASBE as we go forward.

3. CONSENT ITEMS

- A. Consideration to Approve Contract Abstracts
- B. Consideration to Approve the Bidding Threshold for School Districts Pursuant to ARS 15-213 for FY 2004-2005 at \$32,899.
- C. Consideration to Approve an Amendment to Increase Grades Served Under the Arizona Academy of Science and Technology, Inc. Charter.
- D. Consideration to Approve Participation, Provide Conditional Approval and Approve Denials for School Districts Currently Participating in the Career Ladder Program to Participate Again in FY 2005 (These Recommendations Modify the Board's Action from January 26, 2004).
- E. Consideration to Approve Eligible Districts to Continue Participation in the Dropout Prevention Program for School Years 2005, 2006 and 2007 Pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-901.
- F. Consideration to Accept the Voluntary Surrender of the Credentials of the Following Certification Cases:
 - 1. Kenneth F. Carling, Case #C-2003-015
 - 2. Aaron D. Mitchell, Case #C-2004-021
- G. Consideration to Accept the Automatic and Permanent Revocation, Pursuant to A.R.S. §15-550, of the Following Certification Cases:
 - 1. Michael Rogers, Case #C-2003-092

H. Consideration to Accept the Recommendations of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and Approve Certification for the Following Individuals:

1. Jon Patrick Anderson, Case #C-01-01-03

Dr. Pedicone requested that the Jon Patrick Anderson item be set aside for discussion. Motion by Dr. Diethelm to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of Item H. Seconded by Ms. Hoover. *Motion passes.*

Mr. Yanez presented background information regarding Mr. Jon Patrick Anderson, Case #C-01-01-03. Dr. Pedicone asked for clarification regarding the mistaken identity situations, which occurred several years apart, and that strong investigation of the subject matter was conducted to the point the PPAC feels confident.

Mr. Yanez responded that the incident occurred in 1971 and both arrests stemmed from Mr. Anderson's associations at that time and it did appear to be mistaken identity.

Ms. Basha asked for clarification regarding what "association" meant.

Mr. Yanez stated that statements in both arrests indicate that he associated with individuals that were engaged in criminal activity. Mr. Anderson was arrested in connection with the theft of a car in which he was a passenger, and charges were later dismissed. The second incident was similar circumstances.

Dr. Diethelm asked what Mr. Anderson has been doing for the past 30 years and Mr. Yanez indicated he has been actively pursuing further education, submitting extensive documentation to that affect from various institutions. Dr. Diethelm asked if the PPAC had looked at this information and Mr. Yanez reported that they did as indicated in their findings.

Ms. Hilde noted that from information in the backup materials, Mr. Anderson has obtained a doctorate in theology and is accredited to be a chaplain for the armed services.

Ms. Basha asked if both incidents occurred in 1971 and Mr. Yanez replied this was correct.

Ms. Bittner asked if the PPAC checked to see if there has been any other criminal charges or activities during this period of time.

Mr. Yanez stated that during that period of time there have been no other arrests and since then, Mr. Anderson has applied for a fingerprint card as part of the process and received that card without even having to appear at a hearing.

Motion by Dr. Pedicone to approve certification for Mr. Jon Patrick Anderson. Seconded by Ms. Kramer. *Motion passes.*

4. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Mickey Geenan, Harcourt Assessment, Inc., addressed the State Board of Education regarding the decision made on March 29, 2004 awarding the state testing contract. Mr. Geenan stated the decision affects the accountability system relative to AYP and AZ LEARNS. Mr. Geenan further stated that the Request for Proposal clearly stated that the company getting the business must do equating and provide "compelling evidence that there is continuity, reliability, and validity with the previous data scale." Mr. Geenan stated that CTB has proposed a fall equating, meaning that this coming fall they will re-administer the Stanford 9 for a group of students at each grade level. This is the same tests they took three months ago. The same students will also take the Terra Nova. The other issue is that they are taking the complete battery of Stanford 9 versus the survey battery of the Terra Nova. Once that is completed, the data will be analyzed but there also has to be a conversion from a 3-parameter model to a single-parameter model and that is measurement issues. It is critical that after that data is analyzed there is an estimation that has to be made as to taking fall tests, how our youngsters will do in spring '05 and estimating how they will do. Mr. Geenan stated that they firmly believe that this runs a serious risk of under-predicting or over-predicting therefore the state will be in a position of not knowing how the students will perform in '05. Mr. Geenan stated that this brings the following questions to mind:

- What effects will this have on AZ LEARNS and AYP data and the ranking of schools?
- What about students?
- What about classrooms?

- What about the public and the confidence they presently have in the Arizona assessment system and might that be questioned?
- Are the results/data from the new assessment going to be based on student performance or the assessment?
- Is there uncertainty against the '05 testing?
 - i. Test in '05, evaluate results after scoring versus the scaling that was done in '06;
 - ii. Harcourt predicts we will not know the scaling versus '05 data until Spring '06 results.

Mr. Geenan stated that with the continuance of the Stanford 9 series to Stanford 10, there is assurance of the competence of the scale as well as a single-parameter model, which is the approved and used model by the state. Mr. Geenan presented a white paper to the Board members and asked them to review it.

5. GENERAL SESSION

A. Consideration to Accept the Recommendations of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and Deny Certification for the Following Individual:

1. Douglas Tangeman, Case #C-2004-039R

Mr. Yanez presented background information. Mr. Tangeman addressed the Board stating that in this country we don't execute people for littering, that he is a Master Teacher with two Master's Degrees, and has applied to the Peace Corps as a teacher. Mr. Tangeman stated the only thing he did was leave a voice mail for someone who had him spend two hours filling out essay questions and was immediately asked to leave when he saw the interviewer. Mr. Tangeman stated this man was not his employer but was a very rude, very vicious employee of one school. Mr. Tangeman stated he went through channels, notified the person's boss who would not talk to him. Mr. Tangeman stated again that all he did was leave a voice mail, that he did not threaten him, the voice mail could be called rude and not nice, but he was never questioned by the police and never arrested, it was not a crime, not improper, not immoral. Mr. Tangeman stated that if the Board was going to fire teachers for getting angry and doing something as a private citizen, they would have to fire every teacher in Arizona. Mr. Tangeman stated there are no allegations that he did anything improper ever during his employment. Mr. Tangeman asked the Board not to revoke his livelihood. He stated he is a good teacher and cannot believe this has gotten to this point. Mr. Tangeman referred to the previous applicant who was accused of murder and drunk driving and whose application was accepted when it was found the charges were not affirmed and that Mr. Tangeman himself was never even charged with anything. Mr. Tangeman stated that we don't fire teachers who have spent \$50,000 on their education and fully intend to go back to teaching because you don't like what they have said on a voice mail and that is what this is all about. Mr. Tangeman stated he was pleading with the Board to not stop him from going into the Peace Corps and do not stop him from doing what he has spent his life doing all over a voice mail.

Ms. Kramer asked what the message was on the voice mail?

Mr. Tangeman stated he told him that nobody in his whole life had treated him so rudely; no one has thrown him out of an office when he went for an interview. Mr. Tangeman stated the person had his resume and letters of recommendation and essay questions a full week before the interview. When Mr. Tangeman walked into his office, he took one look at his resume and told Mr. Tangeman to leave, so on the voice mail Mr. Tangeman stated he did not threaten him and stated he thinks he said he hoped his dog choked, so he guessed the Humane Society could sanction him for that. Mr. Tangeman continued that the voice mail was not illegal, not immoral, and not improper, it was rude, but what the person did to him was even ruder. Mr. Tangeman stated he would not do anything like this again and that he is astonished that revoking his livelihood is being considered. Mr. Tangeman asked what time the hearing is for the teacher in Scottsdale who slapped her students, that she still has her certification and that the police were called on her. Mr. Tangeman stated he has not talked to police ever in his life about anything.

Ms. Hoover asked Mr. Tangeman about a voice mail that he referred to being left to a male person. Ms. Hoover stated that there was also a voice mail left to a Dr. Suzie Bogom.

Mr. Tangeman replied, "Absolutely." He stated there was no profanity. He stated he drove all the way to the Verde Valley to be considered for a reading position, that once again he had to do 50 essay questions, drive for three hours to get there and when he walked in for the interview she asked if he was certified. Mr. Tangeman stated that he filled everything out a week ago and that she had gotten everything and that was the course of the interview. Mr. Tangeman stated he did not threaten her and that he has never threatened anybody.

Dr. Pedicone stated the Board has a copy of the police report and while trying to understand Mr. Tangeman's position, cannot read the document and won't, but it includes more than threatening a golden retriever and hoping it died, but also hoping the man's wife got killed in a car accident and it goes on to say some pretty indicting things with very, very inappropriate language. Dr. Pedicone stated this is more than just a serious phone message.

Mr. Tangeman responded that everybody in this room has gotten angry when they have been mistreated. He stated that he did not say this to him in person, it is not a crime, not a threat, but it was rude and he was upset. Mr. Tangeman stated he is sorry he did that, but to fire him as a teacher forever over that is like being Alice in Wonderland and he is astonished and the whole world is turned upside down. Mr. Tangeman asked the Board members if they didn't have more important things to consider?

Ms. Hilde asked if Mr. Tangeman was applying for an extension to a provisional certificate rather than moving to the standard certificate and if he was still lacking classes?

Mr. Tangeman replied that there is a requirement of two full years of teaching for the certificate and he has not yet had that. Mr. Tangeman stated that he would like that and he certainly has had enough classes and in case the Board doesn't know it, his background is that he is fully certified K-12, reading and gifted.

Ms. Hilde asked regarding the Washington Elementary District employment in 2000 and that Mr. Tangeman left prior to the end of the contract year?

Mr. Tangeman replied, "Yes, Mam".

Ms. Hilde asked if he was notified at that point that that becomes a point at which a district can notify the PPAC?

Mr. Tangeman said no one ever informed him. Mr. Tangeman stated he was upset at the last hearing and explained that he was in a very, very untenable and impossible situation with the school. Mr. Tangeman stated he is a certified reading expert and certified English teacher and was given one book to teach, the Sherwin Method of Grammar, which was diagramming sentences all day every day. He stated he could not stand it, went to the principal numerous times asking to teach creative writing and literature and reading and not just do grammar exercises. Mr. Tangeman said the principal stated she could not change that and Mr. Tangeman stated he left his job and went to work for the state at Eagle Point High School at the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections as a high school teacher.

Ms. Basha asked if Mr. Yanez had any further information to add to which Mr. Yanez replied "No."

Motion by Dr. Diethelm to accept the recommendation of the PPAC and deny certification of Mr. Douglas Tangeman. Seconded by Ms. Hilde. *Motion passes.*

Mr. Tangeman stated he opposed and asked what his appeal rights are.

Ms. Basha stated that he is entitled to a hearing and will receive information from staff.

At this point, the Board moved to Item 5K to accommodate the audience.

B. Presentation and Discussion of Arizona NAEP Alignment Study Executive Summary.

Dr. Cindy Paredes, State NAEP Coordinator, presented the background information, as provided in the Arizona NAEP Alignment Study Executive Summary, and stated that she was here today to answer any questions regarding updates on these activities going on in Arizona currently. (See materials packet).

Ms. Hilde stated that the 4th grade state alignment was strong and asked about an area covered by NAEP in 4th grade that was not covered by the state until much later. In addition, Ms. Hilde mentioned that our 8th grade alignment is there and asked what happened to those years in Arizona, i.e., is it a curriculum issue, are our standards significantly off track in terms of aligning with NAEP, and do we need to hold firm with that which is important to us around our standards or do we need to begin to look at ratcheting

up our math standards?

Dr. Paredes, speaking specifically to math, referred to page 9 of the Executive Summary where those goals are shown. In 4th grade math, there was a high degree of alignment, however in 8th grade math there was a low degree of alignment. Dr. Paredes stated there are many reasons that might be the case and that a lot happens between those years. Dr. Paredes explained the differences in the questions on the tests, some lower than 8th grade level, and some are very difficult involving the use of a calculator where a calculator is either provided or the students are allowed to use one on the assessment. Therefore, the framework for the math assessment involves quite a bit of calculative usage for square root in the 8th grade assessment whereas in the 4th grade assessment, calculation by hand is expected in most cases. Dr. Paredes cited last year's math results stating that Arizona increased ten points from '02 to '03 in 4th grade math. Dr. Paredes stated in her opinion we are on the right track, but that between 4th and 8th grade, there is a significant increase in what is expected for 8th graders in math which will take some time with the standards and implementation promoting what needs to be done between those grade levels. Workshops are planned that will focus on NAEP standards.

Dr. Pedicone stated it is important to analyze and align what is expected of students on the assessments and asked if the standards are at issue or the way the standards are assessed on AIMS? He asked Dr. Paredes what this will look like in terms of whether we are going to be guiding our students toward a national agenda rather than what we believe is important?

Dr. Paredes stated that the standards have been looked at in relation to their alignment with NAEP and now there are some results to indicate how the standards look compared to the NAEP framework. She continued that the item review of the study was incomplete because they cannot look at an entire NAEP test and compare it entirely to an AIMS assessment, so for that reason, there is a gap in understanding exactly how those two tests match up. However, Dr. Paredes stated that the findings so far are that there is a high degree of alignment existing in what the framework and standards look like between NAEP and Arizona. She added that they would like to promote awareness of NAEP and NAEP's free instructional tools for teachers. Among these materials are release items that offer teachers, parents and students enough information to score their own practice tests and see what the students are expected to do at 4th, 8th and 12th grades.

Dr. Pedicone asked if there were schools that have to participate and Dr. Paredes responded that next year over 200 schools will have to participate in both math and reading. Science is optional but this assessment will be given at the same time in the same classrooms.

Dr. Pedicone asked if this would give a better profile of how Arizona students do and whether copies will be available of the practice NAEP tests. Dr. Paredes clarified that anyone is able to access released NAEP items off the web and they have also been added to the Arizona Department of Education web site. In making these items available, Dr. Paredes explained that they hope to give exposure to what might not be on the AIMS but is on NAEP.

Dr. Pedicone stated that Arizona teachers are expected to be held accountable for AIMS questions and if NAEP is added then teachers will also be expected to be accountable for those NAEP questions. He asked how much of a departure is this from previous requirements and will teachers feel even greater pressure? Dr. Paredes clarified that NAEP is not a high stakes test and Dr. Pedicone stated it is really a high stakes test because it profiles how students are doing in Arizona and either lends credibility or it doesn't to the testing process. Dr. Pedicone said that administrators and teachers will feel it is a high stakes test even though it is not required.

Dr. Paredes added that NCLB has added pressure for teachers, parents and students all to step up to the plate toward proficiency that may or may not be deemed reasonable by many educators. However, Dr. Paredes did not feel that providing free instructional materials and promoting awareness is instilling more pressure on students or teachers. If it is perceived that way, Dr. Paredes stated they welcome any suggestion to modify that perception and help teachers become more aware.

Dr. Pedicone asked how difficult this will be for the teachers to teach in a way in which positive results can be seen in NAEP and at the same time stay the course regarding what is important relative to AIMS? Dr. Paredes stated they expect some improvement when the '05 results come in just based on awareness

alone. From 1992-2002 NAEP reading results were a flat line with no significant improvement and with the broadening awareness at professional development workshops next year's testing should show some kind of improvement.

Superintendent Horne stated that the performance objectives are what we expect our teachers to teach and the NAEP framework is the basis for the NAEP test. He added that the important thing is to be sure the performance objectives match as much as possible the NAEP framework so we will know teachers are teaching what the kids are going to be tested on. Mr. Horne stated that in 4th grade math, 75% of the items have almost full match to the performance objectives, but in 8th grade math only 38% of the items have an almost full match which would indicate a need to refine the math standards.

Dr. Paredes cautioned that this might be jumping a little bit because what is different about the NAEP framework and what was found in the comments from reviewers had a lot to do with the calculator usage mentioned earlier and some of the high difficulty items on the 8th grade math NAEP tests. The state AIMS is looking for an acceptable level of achievement for all 8th grade students and those higher level items on the NAEP tests are not necessarily something to be matched to our 8th grade standards.

Superintendent Horne added that we need to be looking at the match between performance objectives and the framework and probably the 8th grade math.

Dr. Paredes stated that there is a low degree of alignment and welcomes any advice. In addition, her responses include broadening awareness and showing people what is available as free resources regarding 8th grade math and hopefully integrating those missing pieces into instruction in the classroom.

Dr. Diethelm stated that what has been described is precisely the short term solution and the right actions to take in the future, however, the standards need to be looked at and in his opinion regarding the 38%, that 70% match is unacceptable and suggested that adjustment and alignment are necessary to make sure we are teaching what students need to know in order to succeed on all tests. Dr. Diethelm also added that through the process of alignment there should not be a fear of making the standards higher because as time goes on, that's what living in this world requires, i.e., standards continually improving.

Dr. Pedicone stated that the expectations must be identified as to what is expected out of the standards and what is being assessed and stated he is troubled by the idea that alignment with NAEP must be done. Our actions should be educationally sound and have an outcome that is not just an empty promise but lets the student know what is expected when they pass the tests. Dr. Pedicone stated that maybe we need to analyze what is being done and make sure what is being done is right.

Dr. Paredes stated that at their June conference there will be a panel discussion presenting alignment methodology with NAEP for all states, a method that Dr. Paredes' team piloted. All other states are in the same mindset looking at how they can do better on NAEP and their state assessments and not conflict with what is being offered teachers in those two categories.

Dr. Pedicone stated that he thinks it is a policy issue where questions can be answered and good guidance be given so he wants to make sure the right questions are being asked ethically and appropriately. He stated he is not questioning that the Department is doing anything wrong but is questioning the things that are guiding them.

Dr. Paredes stated she is open to further dialogue and that members are welcome to contact her any time for further conversations.

Ms. Hilde asked about the artifacts used in the NAEP tests, i.e. calculators on 8th grade math test, and asked Dr. Paredes to look at the impact regarding our tests.

Dr. Paredes stated there has been some NAEP research on calculator use and how that possibly masks achievement in the lower grades, but the controversy of being able to calculate by hand or whether to use a calculator and whether or not the achievement is masked is really an issue for the lower grades. In the 8th grade math they are preparing for high school using graphic calculators frequently in higher level math. She added that our AIMS does not require calculator use, is a multiple choice assessment, whereas NAEP uses manipulatives, calculators, and requires assessment on questions that don't require the use of calculators but the use of being able to interpret a calculator screen. Dr. Paredes suggested she could talk more with standards implementation about how this might impact AIMS.

Ms. Basha thanked Dr. Paredes for a thorough report and presentation.

C. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve the AZ READS Task Force Recommendations, Including, But Not Limited To Definitions of Reading Assessments and Intensive Reading Instruction Pursuant to A.R.S. 15-704.

Ms. Marie Mancuso, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Standards Based Teaching and Learning, School Effectiveness, Arizona Department of Education, presented background information and the overview of the task force recommendations. Ms. Sylvia Gonzales presented the results of a report from WestEd resulting from public comment in response to the AZ READS Task Force Recommendations. Mr. Doug Peeples, Manager, Contracts and Purchasing Unit, Arizona Department of Education, presented the results of the Request for Proposals elicited for assessments that meet the criteria the task force is recommending. Dr. Carrie Hancock, Education Program Specialist, Arizona Department of Education, reported on the year-one Reading First results stating that starting in Kindergarten makes a huge difference. (See materials provided for each presentation in packet).

Ms. Mancuso stated they are proud of the schools that have made remarkable progress in this first year and asked the Board to consider the recommendations put forward today.

Dr. Pedicone commented since the first introduction to Reading First this plan has come a long way and commended them on a great job.

Ms. Bittner acknowledged that the non-Reading First schools are now having reading specialists in to assist and Ms. Mancuso reiterated they have worked hard to build a statewide infrastructure to provide this kind of training for all schools in Arizona.

Ms. Hilde asked if the Arizona Department of Education would be ordering all tests to get the quantity price or is there a way for small/rural schools to bring down the \$9.71 cost of each test.

Mr. Peeples responded that the small/rural schools could form an ordering co-op to bring the costs down and that the \$9.71 price is the worst case basis and is for a two-year test program for a student.

Ms. Hilde suggested that the state could at least initiate that dialogue of encouraging some kind of collaborative consortium effort to help bring the costs into the range of the other one. She suggested this could be a statement of efficiencies possible for small/rural districts so they know of other options.

Superintendent Horne asked if a purchase order for the state could be created so each school could order under that purchase order and get the same low price. Mr. Peeples stated the state does not have funding to purchase ahead without obtaining commitments from each school. Superintendent Horne reiterated that the schools would pay for the tests but place the order through the state purchase order so everyone could get the quantity discount and Mr. Peeples responded that they could look at that possibility.

Dr. Diethelm added that this program is on the right track and doing a good job. He suggested that the diagnostics have to be for all students and even though a student is doing well on any particular assessment the more they can be helped in reading the better off they will be as they go into the rest of their lives. He also suggested that teachers ought to write a reading assessment evaluation for each student with suggestions in an action plan for improvement if needed.

Ms. Mancuso responded that the assessment systems provide measures three times/year for all students giving specific information about all of the students in the system. The diagnostic measures as defined are for those students who are not responding/progressing and the goal is to understand why that is.

Dr. Hancock added that the diagnostics Dr. Diethelm may be referring to are a bit more informal, observational and instructional day-to-day, for students who are on track, but the diagnostics that are referred to in the recommendations are for the at-risk students for a formal, reliable and valid assessment to determine where the gaps are.

Dr. Diethelm noted it is important for all students to have an action plan and the more objective data one has, the better off we are.

Ms. Basha reiterated the two actions requested today by the AZ READS Task Force. Motion by Dr. Diethelm to approve the AZ READS Board Policy for the implementation of A.R.S. 15-704 based on recommendations received from the Task Force. Seconded by Dr. Pedicone. *Motion passes.*

Dr. Diethelm asked relative to the two proposed suppliers if the task force is in agreement with those assessments and suppliers. Ms. Mancuso responded, "most definitely" and added that with these two and the addition of DIBELS, there are three very sound and rigorous assessment systems for schools to choose from. Ms. Mancuso also

added that there is a range in cost from DIBELS which is almost free to the costs of the other tests, stating that while the selection is limited, there is a choice of options.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm to approve the Edformation and Capital Spectrum, Inc. procurement for K-3 assessments for screening, diagnosis and progress monitoring from which districts/schools may choose in addition to DIBELS. Seconded by Ms. Kramer. *Motion passes.*

Ms. Basha thanked the committee for the wonderful work and added that full-day kindergarten might also make a difference.

The Board took a lunch break at 1:00PM and reconvened at 1:35PM.

Ms. Basha noted that Items I and J have been postponed but there will still be opportunity for public comment today.

At this time the Board went to Item E to accommodate members of the public who were waiting to address the Board.

- D. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve Policies Regarding R7-2-604 Professional Preparation Programs and Teacher Preparation Program Requirements With Regard to Awarding Institutional Recommendations for Additional Programs Offered At Board-Approved Professional Preparation Programs, the Process for Approving Program Amendments and the Process for Approving New Professional Preparation Programs. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A) (3) And (4), the Board may vote to go into Executive Session for consultation And legal advice and/or for instructing the Board's attorneys regarding The Board's position in connection with this issue.

Ms. Patty Hardy, Supervisor of Certification Specialists, Arizona Department of Education, presented the background information and two issues the committee is requesting guidance on until the new rubric is developed:

- New program approvals submitted by institutions with existing State Board approved professional preparation programs;
- New institutional approval for institutions of higher education seeking State Board approval of professional preparation programs.

Ms. Hardy reiterated the recommendations for action today are:

- New programs submitted by State Board approved institutions will be evaluated according to the existing rubric and granted conditional approval with the approval date of December 31, 2005 which was previously approved by this Board in March 2004;
- Ability to evaluate and accept new institutional requests until June 30, 2004, that will be evaluated on the current rubric, granted two-year conditional approval, but that renewals will be based on what the new rubric adopted by the State Board of Education at a subsequent date; and
- The State Board will not accept applications for new institutions or new program approvals after June 30, 2004 until a better scoring guide is designed.

Dr. Diethelm asked if the Board will know what the new or different requirements will be? Ms. Kathy Wiebke, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Highly Qualified Professionals, Arizona Department of Education, responded that a team of stakeholders in the different teacher preparation programs will be set up over the summer to develop the rubric and Board members are invited to come to the meetings. The goal is to present preliminary information to the Board in the Fall before it is submitted for final approval. Dr. Diethelm noted that the program should be very clear in their application, content and execution, that they support the Arizona Standards and Assessments, they train teachers in how to use these to develop lesson plans, how to use diagnostics and other assessments. He stated that they should be told in advance that this is what is going to be expected. Ms. Wiebke noted that they could do that.

Ms. Basha noted that action needs to be taken in three steps and asked for a motion for the first step.

Motion by Ms. Hilde to approve requests from institutions with current Board approval of their professional preparation programs to have additional academic programs reviewed based on the existing rubric and recommendations for approval or rejection be forwarded to the Board. Conditional approval of these additional programs will be added to the existing IR of the institution and will therefore expire on

December 31, 2005 with the institution's existing IR. It is incumbent on the institutions to advertise this expiration date to their students (pursuant to Board Rule R7-2-604(D)). Seconded by Ms. Bittner. *Motion passes.*

Motion by Ms. Kramer to direct staff to continue to accept and evaluate requests received from institutions requesting initial Board approval of their professional preparation programs for applications received prior to June 30, 2004 based on the existing rubric. Upon recommendation from the review team and approval by the Board no later than August 30, 2004, these programs will receive a conditional two-year approval as provided for under Board Rule. This approval should clearly include notification, however, that the conditions for additional conditional approvals or full approval are currently under review and will likely be modified during the programs' conditional approval. All renewals will be based on new criteria adopted by the Board. Seconded by Dr. Diethelm. *Motion passes.*

Motion by Ms. Hoover that the Board will not accept applications for new professional preparation programs or institution approvals after June 30, 2004. This is based on the current review and request for modification of existing Board Rules in this area and the expectation that such recommendations will be presented to the Board no later than January 2005. Seconded by Dr. Pedicone. *Motion passes.*

Ms. Basha told Ms. Wiebke the Board would like to have an opportunity for her to present to the Board prior to the action in the Fall. Ms. Wiebke agreed.

E. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve the Articulated Arizona Academic Standards in Science.

Ms. Basha invited members of the public who needed to speak ahead of the presentation to step forward. Dr. Steven Oscherwitz, Infectious Disease Physician, stated that he uses his science knowledge to help people with life threatening problems and to keep our city safe from bioterrorism. He stated he is also with the FBI and police on the metropolitan medical response team and in these capacities there are a lot of science issues every day. Dr. Oscherwitz urged the Board not to discriminate, as germs do not discriminate in who they attack, and that the science guidelines need to be complete and strong and teaching theology as science is not really something that is going to help us out in the long run. He noted that as human beings on earth we can't hide our heads from the bad guys that want to destroy us whether they are germs or terrorists or others. He urged the Board to provide unbiased science and health information to our children.

Ms. Marie Mancuso, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Standards Based Teaching and Learning, School Effectiveness, Arizona Department of Education, gave background information, thanked the members of the science committee for a year-long commitment and hard work on this document, and those who provided constructive feedback for the revision process. Ms. Mancuso expressed thanks to Ms. Kathy Kay, Director, Standards Developments, Arizona Department of Education and Ms. Lacey Wieser, Education Program Specialist (Science), Arizona Department of Education, for facilitating this process and the consensus building they were able to accomplish through the development and revision process. Ms. Kathy Kay and Ms. Lacey Wieser presented the final draft in a PowerPoint presentation, pointing out changes that have been made since the last public review. (Please see materials in packet) Ms. Kay stated that after the input and revisions they feel this is a much stronger document and feel confident in presenting it today. Ms. Kay cited the following statistics:

- Committee started with 96 ten months ago;
- At this time there are 82 active members;
- At the final vote, 77% of that group voted on the final draft;
- There was one last large meeting and if members were unable to attend they were emailed with the draft and given the opportunity to vote;
- Of the 77% that voted, 100% voted to endorse or accept the final draft;

Other factors noted by Ms. Kay:

- This document meets or exceeds the national standards;
- The committee was very committed to following the guidelines of the national standards and NSES particularly;

- The committee felt the need to challenge students to take that one extra step to plan for their future in a changing technological society;
- They have increased the rigor of content at grade levels in advance of the NSES;
- There is a very strong balance between process and content;
- The hope is that students will have the opportunity to be curious, explore, investigate, have fun with experimentation and inquiries, and be learning content to become scientifically literate members of the community;
- This is a cohesive document providing a solid framework from kindergarten to high school with the appropriate repetition needed at various grade levels in critical content areas; and
- They want the student to be assessed in the best way possible, by a variety of assessment styles including teacher observation, performance objectives, labs, research documents as well as paper/pencil testing.

Ms. Kay stated that on behalf of the ADE staff involved, the 2004 Arizona Science Standards Articulated by Grade Level will provide teachers with a framework for implementing a fair, rigorous and balanced curriculum to enable students to become responsible, scientifically literate members of a local and global community and respectively submitted the final draft for the Board's consideration and approval.

Dr. Diethelm, on behalf of Dr. Crow, stated that Dr. Crow had put forth a thorough analysis and recommendation for some of the wording of the standards as well as some of the directional or implicated standards and asked how that input was incorporated. Ms. Kay replied that they worked directly with a faculty member at ASU, Dr. Jane Maienschein, Regents' Professor, Director, Center for Biology and Society, regarding their recommendations and specific changes were made based on their recommendations. Ms. Kay added that once they saw the changes in the final draft, they gave total approval. Dr. Diethelm asked if Dr. Maienschein was Dr. Crow's delegate and was one of the endorsees to which Ms. Kay replied, "yes".

Dr. Pedicone addressed one of the sensitive issues in the high school crosswalk of biological evolution and the other approaches and asked how was a balance struck with those kinds of issues?

Ms. Kay stated that in terms of the committee, they felt it was an upper grade issue and provided guidance on how that might move down in grade levels. In addition she added that:

- Extensive research was done and those on the life science portion of the committee are very well versed and educated in this area;
- Information was brought in from a variety of sources;
- Communication was ongoing for ten months with those who were in favor of intelligent design or creation approach;
- Any and all information forwarded to her went to the committee for review;
- A full meeting at the high school level directly about the evolution issue occurred and there was a lengthy discussion going through all research, letters, emails;
- Based on extensive discussions, the performance objectives were developed for biological evolution;
- In Strand 2, the nature of sciences, the performance objective is that teachers have their students analyze and question prevailing theories as new evidence is found; and
- Opportunity is there for discussion in the classroom about strengths of one approach versus another approach.

Superintendent Horne stated there are two performance objectives relative to the balance:

- One requires that students learn how existing theories and facts are questioned; and
- One requires that the nature of science is that they are open-minded, skeptical and tolerant.

Ms. Kay pointed out that this is stipulated on page 38 for 6th, 7th and 8th grades and that as early as 5th grade students are taught to retain that curiosity and scientific skepticism.

Ms. Basha noted that the next public member requesting to speak was not present but submitted written comments that were distributed to all Board members for public record.

Mr. Ronald Hoff, Stanfield Elementary School, urged the State Board not to approve the proposed standards. He stated that the proposed standards concerned him because they will transform science education particularly at the middle school level. Many elementary and secondary teachers may take the standards as all-inclusive, many segments of science will be strewn across three years of learning precluding meaningful connections and depth in any area, and the new standards will necessitate the expenditure of millions of dollars for new text. Mr. Hoff added that these standards dumb down science education and the standards identified are only the ones tested on AIMS to the exclusion of other information.

Mr. Glen Turner, retired teacher and administrator, stated he agrees with almost everything the committee came up with, especially the open inquiry, except biological evolution is missing. Mr. Turner referred to P.O.5 stating that this objective is one-sided because it asks only how various aspects of science give support rather than being more open, neutral or inquiry-based. He added that this is incomplete because it doesn't define evolution completely, i.e. micro and macro evolution. Mr. Turner asked for appropriate wording to keep the debate honest and open and not narrowed to the interest of those who want to promote only a personal, naturalistic viewpoint but include all evidence, both supportive and contradictory.

Mr. William Alsentzer, Attorney, referred to a letter he sent to the State Board on May 10, which urged the adoption of the requirement to use an unbiased critical analysis curriculum modeled in the one adopted two or three months ago by the Ohio Board of Education for teaching not only the strengths but weaknesses of the theory of macro evolution. Mr. Alsentzer noted that even evolutionists are in a quandary and can't agree among themselves as to how evolution could have possibly occurred considering the absence of their immediate-type fossils and other matters. Mr. Alsentzer asked that students be made specifically aware of opinions and studies as well as the pros and cons of the theory of macro of evolution, which is only a theory at best. He stated that P.O.5 on page 60 is biased and noted that the Ohio curriculum gives both sides with challenges and support for the theory of evolution and urged the State Board to consider the important concepts so a balanced presentation can be given our students.

Mr. Bob Furlong, Committee for Science Objectives, Evolutionary Ecologist, Molecular Biologist, Teacher, stated it is imperative that these objectives be passed for the following reasons:

- If Arizona has a rigorous science education, scientists can be attracted to our state;
- To honor those who worked to develop the standards; and
- There are very few scientists who don't believe in organic evolution.

Mr. Furlong stated that this series of science objectives are necessary for excellence in education in Arizona.

Mr. William LongReed, Tuba City Unified Schools #15, Navajo Indian, stated his Native American heritage and that he has been teaching 19 years, mostly biology, in Tuba City High School, as well as serving with the National Science Standards in the 90's. Mr. LongReed stated the standards are for the children, the future leaders of their tribes, to teach them to think critically and if the standards are not approved, a lot of kids will be left behind.

Mr. Barry Roth, Science Coordinator, Tucson Unified School District, co-chair of the Arizona Science Coordinators Association, and a member of the committee that wrote the document being presented today. Mr. Roth expressed his satisfaction and support for the document and the process by which it was written. Mr. Roth noted that the Arizona Department of Education did not impose its judgment or will on the committee, but rather facilitated the process so that the committee was able to work through the problems. He stated the committee did not work in a vacuum but was surrounded by research-based documentation, the National Science Education Standards and NAEP standards. Mr. Roth said that one question constantly came to the minds of the committee members to remind them of what they were about and that was, "What does every child in the state of Arizona need to know and be able to do in order to be a successful productive member of our society?" and stated that he believes this document answers that question.

Motion by Ms. Hilde to adopt the Arizona 2004 Science Standards Articulated by Grade Level. Seconded by Dr. Diethelm. *Motion passes.*

Dr. Diethelm responded to the comment that the performance objective may be on the AIMS test by stating that as time goes on and tests evolve that is liable to change. Therefore, he stated he did not feel this was useful information to have appended to the standard.

Ms. Basha thanked the task force for the amount of work and time taken to accomplish this task.

F. Presentation, Discussion and Possible Consideration to Approve an Initial Definition and Framework for the Governor's "Master Teacher" Initiative to Publish for Public Comment.

Ms. Basha stated that staff is working with the Governor's Office and this item will be moved ahead. Ms. Epstein stated the timeline for presentation of the framework is up to the discretion of the Board and that it is not governed by a particular law or statute. Ms. Epstein suggested that further development will be done and perhaps presented at the June 2004 meeting.

G. Presentation and Discussion of the Status of Notice of Final Rulemaking For R2-7-405, R-2-7-407, R2-7-610 and R2-7-612 Regarding Exceptional Student Services, Including Administrative Rules, Educational Interpreters And Braille Literacy, Including Consideration of Possible Additional Rulemaking Action.

Ms. Epstein reported that to date there is not official action on these rules from the Attorney General's Office. Until final word has been received on these rules, no further action can be taken. Ms. Epstein stated that hopefully in June 2004 a more specific report will be available.

Dr. Diethelm asked if the 60 days were up and Ms. Epstein replied that the rules were approved by the State Board at the end of January 2004 and submitted to the Attorney General's Office shortly after that, so this is after the 60 days.

Dr. Diethelm asked if the promised time is well-past expired and Ms. Epstein confirmed.

Superintendent Horne added that a priority in legislation next year is to change the rulemaking process, work with the Attorney General's Office if possible, but that there are some agencies exempt from the process who are able to expedite this issue.

H. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve Closing the Record and Notice of Final Rulemaking for R7-2-708 Regarding Eliminating the Default Hearing Procedure from Board Disciplinary Hearing Rules.

Mr. Vince Yanez, Lead Investigator, Investigative Unit, Arizona State Board of Education, presented this item for consideration and outlined the background information of the process in place. Mr. Yanez reminded the Board that this default is really a hindrance to provide a timely disposition of the cases, is cumbersome and this will repeal the default hearing.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm to close the rulemaking record and approve the Notice of Final Rulemaking for R7-2-708 regarding eliminating the default hearing procedure from Board disciplinary hearing rules.

Seconded by Ms. Hilde. *Motion passes.*

I. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve Opening the Docket and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for R7-2-1001 and R7-2-1011 Regarding On-Line Bidding for School District Procurement.

Ms. Basha stated that this item has been postponed.

J. Presentation, Discussion and Possible Consideration of Action, Including But Not Limited to Approving Notice of Supplemental Rulemaking for R7-2-1116 and R7-2-1116.01 Regarding Alternative Project Delivery Methods for School District Procurement.

Ms. Basha stated that this item has been postponed.

K. Presentation, Discussion and Possible Consideration for Further Action Concerning Proposed Rule Amendments to R2-7-613 Regarding Structured English Immersion Endorsement for Teacher Certification, Including But Not Limited To, Consideration to Approve Notice of Supplemental Rulemaking or to Close the Record and Approve Notice Of Final Rulemaking.

Ms. Epstein provided background information including the timeline for public comment that has taken place to date. In addition, Ms. Epstein stated that further guidance from the Board is requested as to what

rulemaking paperwork should be brought back for the Board's consideration and approval. As background Ms. Epstein stated:

- In February 2004 the Board considered and approved proposed rules defining a Structured English Immersion (SEI) endorsement;
 - i. Rules were promulgated under the Board's general authority to certify teachers and administrators and pursuant to the Flores stipulation which required the Board to define training, background and qualifications for teachers of English Language Learners (ELLs);
 - ii. HB 2010 required that an SEI endorsement be adopted by the Board and further requires that the provisional SEI endorsement by this Board be incorporated into the curriculum of the teacher preparation programs overseen by the Arizona Board of Regents;
 - iii. The Board heard extensive comment from the public, three options were presented for the Board's consideration and the Board adopted "Option 2" which came out of the Arizona Department of Education's task force recommendation;
- Once those rules were adopted, the public comment period began as provided for under the rulemaking statute.
 - iv. Many written comments have been received;
 - v. An oral proceeding was held on May 12, 2004 presided over by Ms. Farley, Executive Director as the Board's designee;
 - vi. A rough draft of that oral proceeding has been provided to the Board members and copies were available at today's meeting. A full transcript of the oral proceeding will be forthcoming.

Ms. Epstein stated that there is sufficient information at this point to get the Board's guidance as to whether or not any modifications to the current proposed rules are believed to be appropriate and then in June 2004 one of two actions will occur:

- If the Board wants to continue with the current rules proposal and make only technical changes a notice of final rulemaking would be brought to the Board. This would then go to the Attorney General's Office for approval.
- If the Board believes rules should be modified in such a way that under the rulemaking statute a substantial change is necessary, a notice of supplemental rulemaking would be issued and another public comment period would ensue. Notice of final rulemaking would then be brought back to the State Board probably in the Fall for approval. The rules package would then go to the Attorney General's Office.

Ms. Epstein commented that the Board has received a significant amount of public comment concerning these rules, via over 70 letters and about 40 people who spoke at the oral proceedings. There is some overlap between those submitting comments and those speaking at the oral proceeding, but Ms. Epstein stated her count is somewhere around 90 people who have chosen to address the Board on this issue. The comments were from many perspectives including:

- Teachers,
- Specialists in the field of teaching ELLs,
- Curriculum specialists,
- Principals,
- District superintendents,
- Parents,
- Concerned citizens,
- Higher education students and professors and some colleges of education,
- Community and professional organizations,
- Rural and urban districts,
- Native American reservations.

Ms. Epstein stated that most comments received have been supportive of either “Option 2” or “Option 3”. Ms. Epstein provided copies of the rules (see materials packet) and explained that “Option 2” rules define a new Structured English Immersion (SEI) Endorsement for grades K-12 and requires all classroom teachers, SEI specialists, SEI resource teachers, supervisors, principals and superintendents to obtain an SEI endorsement by August 2006 if they don’t already have a bilingual endorsement or an ESL endorsement.

The rule further defines the provisional endorsement, which for teachers certified before August 2006 would require obtaining one semester hour coursework or 15 clock hours of professional development in SEI methods for teaching ELLs. For teachers certified after August 2006, it would require three semester hours of courses in SEI methods for teaching ELLs. This three hour semester requirement for teachers certified after August 2006 is the part of the rule that would need to be incorporated into the curricula of higher education Board of Regents teacher preparation program. The provisional certificate is valid for three years and administrators are required to obtain a standard endorsement which requires an additional three semester hours or 45 clock hours of professional development in teaching English Language Proficiency Standards approved by the Board. Ms. Epstein pointed out that the rules proposal leaves intact the existing bilingual and ESL endorsements. Under this proposal individuals may obtain an ESL endorsement but are not required to do so unless they are providing ESL instruction identified under the rules or if the district requires obtaining additional endorsement.

“Option 3” rules, provided by the Bilingual Consortium and presented to the Board in February 2004, converts the ESL endorsement into an SEI/ESL endorsement requiring this endorsement of individuals who are specialized classroom teachers or specialists or “otherwise responsible for providing instruction to ELLs.” Under the proposal in the current ESL endorsement six semester hours are required to obtain a provisional and to obtain a full endorsement there is an additional 18 semester hour requirement in specified areas such as language instruction, linguistic assessment.

Ms. Epstein highlighted the dominant issues raised in the public comment period.

Criticisms and concerns regarding the current proposal were:

- Insufficient training for teachers of ELLs;
- Fewer course requirements;
- Inconsistent to lower the standards when accountability speaks to raise teacher expectations and qualities;
- Legal issue pursuant to HB 2010 referring to term “courses” rather than one course
- Regarding term “endorsement”, which traditionally denotes a highly specialized level of training and the current rules don’t require the same academic demands as what is required in a typical endorsement: Definitionally calling these requirements an endorsement doesn’t seem to fit or appear to be appropriate in light of the way that term is ordinarily used in the community;
- How would the professional development requirement be monitored?
- Lack of clarity on the existing ESL endorsement under this rules proposal;
- Technical issues pointed out by Mr. Hogan

Ms. Epstein stated that it was suggested the rules should be clear in regard to curriculum, teacher qualification, and comparing instruction provided outside colleges or universities. In addition, it was also stated that while the rules specify training requirements for teachers, it wasn’t clear how administrators fall into those categories. Ms. Epstein stated she believes this can be clarified.

In addition, Ms. Epstein noted the many people who wrote and appeared at the oral proceeding speaking in favor of the current proposal with the following general themes:

- Although SEI course requirements are less than the ESL or bilingual endorsement it nonetheless provides a method of insuring that all teachers and administrators are familiar with providing effective strategies of teaching ELLs ;
- By having SEI endorsements that are readily attainable, districts are permitted to insure that ELLs are integrated throughout the school and classrooms;

- Some educators stated they considered every classroom to be an SEI classroom and if there were burdensome or rigorous course requirements that only a few teachers could meet, it would force districts to place ELLs together in those classrooms with those few teachers, which is contrary to the philosophy of integrating ELLs;
- Rural communities expressed concern regarding “Option 3” as it would make recruiting high quality teachers even more burdensome for districts that already face substantial challenges in that regard and they felt the current rules proposal would provide the training necessary but not impose the requirements that could not be realistically met;

Ms. Epstein continued with additional comments, which gave merit to the other side’s proposal:

- Proponents of “Option 3” also believed the policy of the current rules of providing a broad training and professional development for all teachers and administrators was a positive and desirable outcome;
- Proponents of “Option 2” felt it might be appropriate in certain circumstances to support additional training requirements. There was not a clear formulation of a proposal that emerged but rather general questions were raised.

Ms. Epstein stated that generally the options before the Board are to stay with the rules with little or no modification, direct staff to adopt the “Option 3” rules proposed or to stay essentially with the current rules proposal but to modify or clarify in accordance with what Board members’ preferences are in reaction to public comment.

Dr. Diethelm asked if there is nothing to prevent a district or school from requiring both an ESL and SEI endorsement in order to teach a class that may be predominantly ELLs? Ms. Epstein responded that this is correct that it is not prohibited under the rules proposal.

Ms. Hilde stated that the use of the word “endorsement” seems to be part of what clouds the issue and asked for the two definitions in terms of being used with SEI based on Flores or another rulemaking process and then because this term is used in relation to other endorsements for 18 credit hours.

Ms. Epstein explained why this is being called an endorsement. The Flores stipulation does not require an “endorsement” versus a certificate versus any particular type of certification document, but it provides the Board discretion to determine the training, background and qualifications for teachers of ELLs. The reason why the endorsement language is being used is because HB 2010, requires and uses the words Structured English Immersion Endorsement used in the context that the Board may approve non-college or non-university courses to substitute Board requirements to obtain an SEI endorsement or bilingual endorsement. It also uses SEI endorsement in connecting the Board’s definition of the term with the Board of Regents’ requirement to incorporate the provisional SEI endorsement defined by statute in their curriculum. In light of the statutory language, this is what influenced the rules proposal to date and Ms. Epstein stated she was not sure there was much flexibility in the absence of further legislative clarification that the Board has in terms of terminology.

Dr. Pedicone stated that the issue with this term is that it usually talks about specialization but the concern is that a broad range of teachers might have an ELL student in their classroom and that teacher technically has to have some degree of background but it may be unrealistic to expect the teacher to have a full ESL endorsement. Dr. Pedicone asked if there was any language discussed that might be able to separate those two concepts so the issues are not confused.

Ms. Epstein stated she believes the answer is no, however, the answer to whether there could be distinction among qualifications could be yes, but altering the SEI endorsement language and staying consistent with fulfilling the statutory requirement of HB 2010 has not been presented to date.

Dr. Pedicone asked if it was possible to qualify the language in terms of enforcement and better define the difference between the two concepts?

Ms. Epstein stated the Board can define who should have what qualifications and perhaps levels of endorsement could be a possibility.

Ms. Epstein restated the request of the Board today will not be for official rulemaking but rather guidance for action in June.

Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan, Associate Superintendent of Academic Achievement, Arizona Department of Education, advised the Board on the status of “Option 2” from the public proceedings on May 12. Ms. Garcia Dugan thanked the Board for honoring the process that Ms. Irene Moreno, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Academic Achievement Division, English Acquisition Services Unit, Arizona Department of Education and the task force took in coming up with “Option 2”. Many of the discussions that have transpired were discussed during the task force such as the endorsement that Dr. Pedicone discussed. Ms. Garcia Dugan stated the task force was told the official rulemaking action would not likely be taken today, therefore, none of the classroom teachers or administrators were able to take the day off to come to reiterate the position on “Option 2”. However, the Board heard their testimony at the March 29th Board meeting and has received many letters from teachers, administrators and entire school districts like Tucson Unified School District, Payson, Yuma Unified, Washington Elementary, Gadsen, Prescott, Humboldt and Gilbert which this option would ultimately effect. Ms. Garcia Dugan reiterated that the recommendation for “Option 2” requires all teachers, administrators and supervisors to receive 60 clock hours or four credit units prior to 2010. She also stated that there is room for further clarification, specification and possibly amendment to the proposed rules such as:

- What is an SEI education program to be provided by an accredited institution;
- ESL endorsement could still be acquired by teachers and administrators for a Master’s program of study; and
- The name “endorsement” for 60 hours could also be changed to training if the legislature approves.

Ms. Garcia Dugan stated these were the areas that supporters of “Option 3” were advocating. Ms. Garcia Dugan stated they believe the 60-hours/4 credits is doable and essential for all teachers and administrators versus 270 clock hours/18 credit. She stated this is the difference of what is essential and what is nice to know. Teachers/administrators need to have the hands-on application for better teaching, which the 60 clock hours provide. In addition, “Option 2” allows for both district and higher education to provide the coursework. Since the March 29th Board meeting several conversations with trainers in California have taken place as to their ELL training model for their teachers. Ms. Garcia Dugan stated they were pleasantly surprised to hear that their training requires 60 clock hours for their veteran teachers as well. They have provided the training either at state regional centers, at the university and in the future will offer it online. At the end of their training, there is an exam, which is presently being revamped to more closely align to the training curriculum. In “Option 2” all teachers, administrators and teaching supervisors will be required to take the 60 clock hours of SEI training in order to renew their certificate. Ms. Garcia Dugan stated this is how we will be able to monitor and they believe this is doable by the teachers and administrators because all certificated personnel must have 180 hours every six years to recertify. She also stated that because Arizona’s ELL population has increased and will continue to increase, all teachers will eventually have ELL students in their classrooms and each child deserves a quality teacher trained with ELL strategies and methodologies. In addition, all ELL students must have access to the entire curriculum in order to succeed in our K-12 educational system and hopefully go on to higher education. Ms. Garcia Dugan stated that ELL students would be able to graduate in four years or as close to four years as possible by having all teachers required to have 60 hours. She added that this provides ELLs choices of teachers in the entire curriculum. Therefore, Brown vs. Board of Education would never have to be visited again. By reviewing the Flores consent agreement; proposition 203 and HB 2010 “Option 2” will accommodate all of these mandates.

Dr. Diethelm asked for clarification of the 45 and 60-hour requirement. Ms. Garcia Dugan explained that the 15 provisional plus 45 to renew a certificate equals the 60-hour requirement.

Superintendent Horne stated that one thing that was lost in the debate is the extent to which the task force was a very wide, broad-based task force that worked very hard. He asked for a description of the task force, their duties, how hard they worked and how resentful they became when a compromise was suggested.

Ms. Irene Moreno, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Academic Achievement Division, English Acquisition Services Unit, Arizona Department of Education, stated that initially they started with the highly qualified, special education and bilingual component and then moved into another meeting where the rubric was created.

Superintendent Horne asked how broad-based was the task force?

Ms. Moreno responded that there was representation from ASU, ASU West, UofA, NAU, Rio Salado, Chinle, Nogales, Tucson, Bullhead City, Page, Mesa, Peoria, Sunnyside, Paradise Valley, Glendale Union, Wesleyan Middle Academy, Phoenix Union, Humboldt, Washington Elementary and retired teachers. Included in the membership were representatives from the bilingual consortium. Ms. Moreno added that they spent days in the discussions and people drove in from around the state for these meetings. She added that all the passion and diversity heard at the hearing was discussed at these meetings as well and that they met for a total of five days.

Superintendent Horne asked about the feelings of the task force after there was talk of changing the recommendations and how the task force members felt about the respect shown for the work they had done.

Ms. Moreno responded that because of all the deliberations, diversity and passion involved in the discussions the task force all agreed that this was the best recommendation. While some would like to have it be more, through the discussions at each meeting, the same recommendations were always the result.

Dr. Pedicone asked why there is still such passion and contention after having heard all the arguments from the respected members of the community? He asked if it was semantics, language, concept or all? Ms. Moreno responded that it was probably a combination of all but the main problem seems to be the reference to “endorsement”.

Ms. Bittner stated that at the SEI workshop there were a number of persons that knew nothing about the task force and she cited a rural district that has 7 teachers who have never had an ELL and are not happy about having to do what this will require. Ms. Bittner added that larger districts have collaborative peer teachers and they were not aware of the task force and the invitation to come and speak so she asked Ms. Moreno how notifications were made.

Ms. Moreno stated that letters were sent to the districts, the districts submitted names and those individuals were notified.

Ms. Bittner added that having more people on the task force would be the answer as there may be views that had not been previously expressed. There is a different perspective from an elementary versus high school view. She added that there has to be an agreement to continue to work together and see why the passion is there. Ms. Bittner stated that one of her highest priorities is that a child doesn't lose their home language totally but that they acquire the necessary skills to become successful students. She added that it appears the task force has tried to do that but there are some areas that are still of great concern. Ms. Bittner acknowledged that even though this is a difficult conclusion to reach, we must keep working together to come to a conclusion that will benefit the students as much as possible.

Ms. Moreno reiterated that they had diversity and many discussions regarding all these issues and the same recommendations kept coming to the top.

Ms. Bittner clarified that the word “endorsement” is in the bill and asked if there is no modifying that? Ms. Moreno answered that this is the wording in the bill.

Ms. Basha stated that there are people who would like to address the Board and due to the fact that Dr. Crow is not present and is planning to call in on an agenda item scheduled for 11:00AM, there is 30 minutes for comments at this time. Ms. Basha stated that the Board members have received many letters from the public and assured everyone that all letters were read. In addition, members will read all the public comments that are submitted. Ms. Basha asked those who have requested to address the Board today to direct their comments in addition to the comments already received as the Board is trying to be very thoughtful as they move forward on this issue. Ms. Basha asked speakers to provide more enlightenment for the Board and reminded them there is a limited amount of time.

Dr. Louise Lockard, Bilingual Multicultural Education Instructor, Northern Arizona University, spoke in favor of "Option 3" stating that high standards need to be maintained for all teachers in rural Arizona. Many districts she works with have a high percentage of ELLs, the districts support teachers in obtaining certification and ESL and bilingual endorsements.

Gloria Rivera, Murphy School District, which has 2,500 students with 70% being ELLs. She stated that mainstream classrooms do not exist in Murphy. Mainstream teachers have ELLs. Ms. Rivera stated that the level of expertise of teachers of ELLs has to be extensive and that 60 hours is not enough for language acquisition and she spoke in favor of "Option 3".

Mr. Conrado Gomez, Central Arizona Bilingual Consortium, stated the consortium developed "Option 3" a year ago and he thanked the Board for the process that has been outlined and the Board's willingness to listen to comments from the public. Mr. Gomez stated his concern is that the 15 hours of training is like going back to "sink or swim" if teachers are made experts after this amount of training.

Mr. Tim Hogan, Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest, commented that he has submitted two sets of written comments with one to the substance of the proposed rule and one to the technical details. Mr. Hogan stated this is not about what this is called. The Flores consent agreement doesn't require an endorsement but it requires substance, i.e., specification as to what the qualifications, training and background of the teacher is supposed to be for ELLs. Mr. Hogan stated that "Option 2" will allow teachers with only 15 clock hours to teach 20 ELLs at any grade level, any subject, English or not and this is the problem with "Option 2". Mr. Hogan wanted to make the record clear that "Option 3" was submitted to Ms. Farley last August on behalf of himself and the bilingual consortium, and it is not as if it were a late entry into the discussion. Also Mr. Hogan stated that there is a motion for contempt pending against this Board in the Flores case for not doing these rules sooner. The rules were to have been submitted in July 2001. The motion is still pending in court and he wants it to be absolutely clear that they are not going to return to court so long as the rulemaking is on the right path, which to him means initiating supplemental rulemaking to do the right thing, making sure there are qualified teachers for these kids. Mr. Hogan stated he is willing to take the time, on behalf of the plaintiffs, to get the right decision made. He also stated his concern regarding the cost study that is pending, ordered by HB 2010. This is the real deadline in his mind. This report is due to be filed to the legislature by August.

Superintendent Horne asked Ms. Garcia Dugan to speak again as to the scientific evidence regarding the 60 hours of training.

Ms. Garcia Dugan stated that a lot of the coursework and training needs to be on increased vocabulary and reading comprehension. ELLs are no different from any other student coming to school except for the language. Ms. Garcia Dugan continued that the other coursework in theory and linguistics is nice to know but not essential for the everyday application of the classroom teacher. She cited the research she has read indicates that teachers need the day-to-day training on how to chunk material for students to learn, identify vocabulary, making graphic organizers, and teaching strategies.

Superintendent Horne asked Ms. Garcia Dugan if there was scientific evidence that more than 60 hours is needed and Ms. Garcia Dugan responded not in the information they have gotten and reiterated the information regarding California's requirement being the same, that of 60 hours. Also, for veteran teachers after 9 years, the requirement is only 45 hours.

Julieta Bencomo, community member and former State Board of Education member, spoke about her family who came from Mexico 100 years ago. She did not know English when she entered Kindergarten, and cited the difficulties of language and cultural complexities. Ms. Bencomo stated she does not believe 60 hours is sufficient and favors "Option 3".

Ms. Rose Johns, Language Acquisition Collaborative Peer Teacher, Osborn School District, submitted written material, "Issues Regarding the SEI Endorsement", an excerpt from a widely used intervention program for ELLs published by Sopris West, and over 70 signatures of individuals who strongly support "Option 3". (Please see packet of materials)

Superintendent Horne pointed out that a school district can require the ESL endorsement for those situations where they believe it is appropriate.

Dr. Wayne Wright, ASU East Faculty Associate, former ESL bilingual teacher in California who helped develop the ESL certification in California, has conducted research in ESL/bilingual education in Arizona and teaches ESL endorsement classes. Dr. Wright spoke in support of “Option 3” and stated there is no scientific evidence that 60 hours is sufficient. Dr. Wright added that in his analysis of the law the issue is that once a school has legally met what is required to teach ELLs, teachers won’t have the motivation to fulfill something that is at their own expense. Dr. Wright stated his concern is that everyone will be in a mainstream classroom and the teachers will only have superficial training.

Ms. Lucy Urias, Tempe School District, spoke in favor of “Option 3” and her concern about “Option 2” as to whether the teacher is going to be fully or minimally trained. Ms. Urias stated she believes all ELLs deserve no less than what is wanted for all children and does not believe that “Option 2” provides the minimum requirements for teacher training.

Mr. Sal Gabaldon, Arizona Language Education Council, provided a copy of “The Two Required Areas of Instruction For ELL Education in Arizona” and spoke in support of “Option 3” stating he supports this option out of a sense of panic because in two years high school diplomas are going to be withheld from ELLs. (Please see packet of materials). Mr. Gabaldon stated that the math part of the test is the most difficult for ELLs and “Option 2” does nothing to address the needs of math students and science and social studies students.

Ms. Lulia Montoya, asked the Board to reconsider “Option 3” stating that she found confusion in “Option 2” and “Option 3” is the best plan to educate teachers to teach ELLs in the state-mandated program. She stated that NCLB calls for highly qualified teachers and has strict measures to measure progress in academics. Ms. Montoya reported that she had received 24 email responses from a variety of school districts that all responded stating that 15 clock was not sufficient and one stated it would be difficult for small districts to accomplish. Ms. Montoya added that schools need to be ready for children and she looks forward to guidance from the Board to assure that teachers are indeed ready to provide equal access to the whole curriculum.

Mr. John Wright, Vice President, Arizona Education Association, spoke in the context of his support of “Option 2” on March 26, 2004 and added the perspective of an endorsement and what that means. Mr. Wright explained that endorsement is the outcome of a voluntary choice made by a teacher to advance their knowledge and skills by acquiring a new set of knowledge. Mr. Wright stated that this is an important component for the Board to remember as they make this decision. He reminded the Board that it has the requirement to set basic standards and qualifications for all teachers, which is part of certification. He added that if there is an additional set of expertise that makes a teacher an expert in an area and able to meet specific needs of specific students, that falls under the endorsement requirements and this Board is charged with establishing what those criteria and qualifications are specific to endorsement. Mr. Wright stated it is important to look at the recommendations, which recommendations really pertain to everybody and should be certification and which recommendations for a higher level of expertise would be required of a few people voluntarily seeking that endorsement.

Ms. Sheree Dove, Rio Salado College, spoke in favor of “Option 2” stating their recommendation is for districts to require full ESL endorsement within 3 years of hire or by renewal of certification. Ms. Dove stated they felt it is an additional above-and-beyond training and that they can provide this training. She added that this endorsement adds an additional layer of awareness.

Ms. Susan Rumann, as a citizen, parent, educator in Arizona and a member of CAVC, presented written documentation describing an “Option 4” as well as stating her support of “Option 3”. Ms. Rumann stated that the strengths of “Option 2” and “Option 3” should be married together to come out with a product that is supportive of all ELLs in Arizona, hence the “Option 4” submission. (Please see packet of materials).

Ms. Joan Gilmore, Principal, Sacaton Elementary School District, spoke in support of “Option 3” because she wholeheartedly endorses the district to move into the future to provide its students with the best education. The district has wholeheartedly stepped into the standards that have been raised through the efforts of Superintendent Horne. The district wants to have the highest qualified teachers to meet the needs of its students, and the district believes that “Option 3” will do that.

Ms. Basha asked Ms. Epstein to reiterate that the Board is being asked for guidance today and not an action item per se.

Ms. Epstein asked Ms. Rumann, in comparing “Option 4” to “Option 3”, if they are substantially the same with the exception of the piece under HB 2010 about having Board approval for professional development provided outside university settings folded in. Ms. Rumann responded that this is correct.

Ms. Epstein stated that generally, based on these conversations, what is needed is whether the Board believes any modifications to the rules proposal might be appropriate as direction is being sought for staff and counsel as to what paperwork should be brought back in June. Ms. Epstein stated that the options are to stay with this rules proposal or reverse course and adopt “Option 3” instead. Ms. Epstein stated she was sensing the Board wants to continue with the substance of the current rules proposal but asked if the Board wants rulemaking that simply clarifies some of the issues pursuant to the public comment or whether the Board believes there are other issues related to the rulemaking package that may need to be explored further in which case, the Board might want to consider in June the possibility of asking an advisory task force to explore certain defined issues. Ms. Epstein reminded the Board it depends on the Board’s perspective if the current rules proposal is felt to still be appropriate or whether additional concerns are still out there.

At this time, an attempt was made to connect telephonically with Dr. Michael Crow, and when the attempt was unsuccessful, the discussion of this item continued.

Dr. Diethelm reiterated the two objectives of rules and endorsement and for discussion purposes, he suggested that perhaps staff and a task force could look into the possibility of two endorsements, one called SEI knowledge endorsement, essentially “Option 2”, and the other, SEI expert endorsement, which is an SEI knowledge endorsement plus either the ESL or bilingual endorsement.

Superintendent Horne stated his understanding is that Ms. Farley did not expect any decisions to be made today, but having options available for a June or August decision is helpful.

Ms. Epstein stated that if there are certain options the Board would like to have brought to them in June, the Board, today, does not have to come up with exactly where they are going but direction is needed as to the kinds of things the Board would like to see and what would be appropriate.

Superintendent Horne stated this is as far as options, but the representation he had from Ms. Farley was that no decision was expected today.

Ms. Epstein stated guidance is needed so options can be brought back in June and if some direction as to what the Board options are, staff will not be able to get everything together so the rulemaking process can go forward. Ms. Epstein stated it is good to see where the options lie and get guidance and direction although not official rulemaking action at this time.

Ms. Hoover stated there seems to be a need for perhaps a slight modification or clarification to the proposed rule and one would be perhaps with some clearer sense that a school district may require something greater than what is intended here, especially for the small school district that has trouble hiring math teachers, as an example. Ms. Hoover thought that clarifying the point that a district may place a higher requirement on their teachers if they so wish.

Ms. Hilde asked for clarification that initially bilingual and ESL endorsements continued without regard to what happens to SEI and yet some of the comments today were that the ESL disappears in this process. In addition, Ms. Hilde stated that some of the technical aspects should be looked at and a differentiation for teachers coming from out of state who may have a smaller awareness of the non-English speaker.

Ms. Epstein commented that generally ESL may still be allowed and the student may be placed in bilingual or other generally recognized education methodologies.

Ms. Bittner asked if at this point the bilingual is on a waiver.

Ms. Epstein explained that under Proposition 203 one would only be provided bilingual education under a waiver.

Superintendent Horne stated the ESL endorsement could be required by a district in an SEI program if they felt additional training was needed for a particular situation and Ms. Epstein replied that it certainly could.

Ms. Basha asked if staff and counsel had enough direction from the comments made today and from this body.

Ms. Epstein replied that another possibility for consideration in June could be to go forward with what is in existence now but consider the possibility of an advanced or expert SEI endorsement to try to take into account some of the issues that have come up. If that is the case, Ms. Epstein suggested that perhaps another way the Board could consider accomplishing that would be as in the last set of ELL program rules, initiate a separate rulemaking docket with the idea of making further amendments to the rules but in the interim going forward with the rulemaking process and putting requirements so far in place.

Ms. Basha asked if a motion was needed to this affect and Ms. Epstein stated the Board could make a motion to direct staff and counsel to bring back rulemaking paperwork for approval reflecting the substance of the current proposal with additional clarifying, changes as needed, and also bring back for consideration in June recommendations for allowing further study and possible further modifications. Dr. Pedicone so moved. Seconded by Dr. Diethelm. *Motion passes.*

The Board took a brief break at 11:20AM to again attempt to connect telephonically with Dr. Crow. Attempts were unsuccessful due to time zone differences. The Board reconvened at 11:40AM with Item 5B.

- L. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve Opening the Docket for R7-2-606, R7-2-607, R7-2-608, R7-2-609, R7-2-610, R7-2-611, R7-2-612, R7-2-614, R7-2-617, R7-2-618 and R7-2-619 Regarding Teacher and Administrator Certifications.

Ms. Kathy Wiebke, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Highly Qualified Professionals, Arizona Department of Education, presented this item asking the Board to consider opening the above docket stating that the Certification Task Force has met and presented the preliminary work to the State Board at a previous meeting. She added that this motion is to open the docket to begin the necessary rulemaking procedures.

Motion by Ms. Hoover to approve opening the docket for R7-2-606 through R7-2-612, R7-2-614, and R7-2-617 through R7-2-619 regarding teacher and administrator certifications. Seconded by Ms. Kramer. *Motion passes.*

- M. The Board will Receive Information Regarding C.I. Wilson Academy Charter School, Including Information to Determine Whether Evidence Exists that C.I. Wilson Academy is in Breach of Its Consent Agreement with the Board, Its Charter Contract or is Not in Compliance With State and/or Federal Laws. Discussion and Possible Consideration Of Action the Board Deems Appropriate Regarding C.I. Wilson Academy Charter School, Including, but Not Limited to Withholding 10% of State Aid and/or Issuing A Notice of Intent to Revoke. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A) (3) and (4), the Board may vote to go into Executive Session for consultation and legal advice and/or for instructing the Board's Attorneys regarding the Board's position in connection with this issue.

Ms. Kristen Jordison, Executive Director, Arizona State Board for Charter Schools, presented a background summary of C. I. Wilson Academy's compliance with the Consent Agreement, Exceptional Student Services, the school lunch program and the Arizona State Retirement System. Ms. Jordison highlighted the following:

- At the April 2004 State Board meeting, Mr. Wilson's attorney offered the surrender of C. I. Wilson Academy's charter;
- Staff met with Mr. Wilson and his legal counsel to start articulating the surrender agreement;
- At that time Mr. Wilson expressed he did not want to surrender the charter;
- This past week articulation of that agreement was ceased and articulation for today's presentation of compliance of the above items was resumed;
- This past Thursday, Mr. Wilson indicated it was not his intent to appear to be holding back the surrender, that he did want to continue with the surrender but his desire was to continue trying to find somebody to take over the physical location so students would continue to be served;

- Mr. Wilson asked about a transfer to another charter and Ms. Jordison stated a transfer could not occur and could not be facilitated at this point but if another charter school wanted to take over that physical operation they could amend their charter;
- On Friday, Mr. Wilson presented a letter provided to the State Board at today's meeting that articulates his request to surrender the C. I. Wilson Academy charter; and
- Legal staff drafted a Consent Agreement provided to the State Board at today's meeting for the voluntary surrender and termination of the charter contract.

Ms. Jordison stated she would also outline the status of each compliance issue if the Board desires or the Board has the option of considering the surrender agreement before them today.

Superintendent Horne stated that if Mr. Wilson is surrendering the Board should not have to go through any other discussions at this time.

Ms. Kim Anderson, Assistant Attorney General, stated that she has worked with Ms. Farley, Ms. Jordison and Mr. Wilson in fashioning the consent agreement for the voluntary surrender and termination of the charter contract. She stated that Mr. Wilson has had an opportunity to look at the document before the State Board and is in agreement with it. Ms. Anderson stated the only change that has been made is to paragraphs 8 and 9 regarding the information of students with disabilities, names and addresses and special education records, which will be provided directly to the Arizona Department of Education Exceptional Student Services rather than to the Board.

Ms. Hilde asked if Mr. Wilson held three or four charters but only one with the State Board of Education?

Ms. Jordison responded that this is the K-6 grade level and the other three charters were surrendered at the Charter School Board meeting earlier this month.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm to accept the settlement as described by Ms. Jordison for C. I. Wilson. Seconded by Ms. Hoover. *Motion passes.*

Ms. Hilde asked if there is a way to step back from this or delay the timeline?

Ms. Anderson responded that the agreement has been crafted so that it is very specific as to a termination date being June 30, 2004 and as indicated, Mr. Wilson who is present today, is in agreement.

5. ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn by Superintendent Horne. Seconded by Dr. Diethelm. *Motion passes and meeting was adjourned at 3:00PM.*